

Remarks

Claims 2 to 10 are amended and claim 11 is added. Claims 1 to 11 are pending in this application of which claims 1, 2, 7 and 10 are in independent form.

Claims 2 and 10 contain allowable subject matter so that these claims are amended herein to incorporate all the features and limitations of claim 1 from which they had depended. Accordingly, claims 2 and 10 should now be in condition for allowance. Claim 11 is added and corresponds to claim 7 but is dependent from claim 2 so that this claim too should be allowable as should claims 3 to 6, 8 and 9 which are all dependent from claim 2.

Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al. The following will show that claims 1 and 7 patentably distinguish the applicants' invention over this reference.

Suzuki et al discloses a hydraulic bushing which includes a rotor 52 which connects the work chamber 28 to the compensating chamber 12 via different channel paths. The rotor 52 has a through-hole 54 which connects the work chamber 28 to the passage 32 in a first position thereof (see FIG. 5) and connects the work chamber 28 to the passage 34 in the other rotational position (see FIG. 4). The two passages 32 and 34 are of different lengths and cross section and therefore provide different frequency matchings of the overall hydraulic bushing arrangement. During operation, this hydraulic bearing system is

continuously matched anew.

In contrast to Suzuki et al, the applicants have a fixed area ratio of the work chamber and the transfer channel 14a or 14b. The transfer channel is matched with respect to its cross section and its length to the effective area of the work chamber 10 and is so matched that, during normal operation of a diesel engine, the acoustic disturbance noises are filtered away especially a resonant frequency of approximately 130 Hz.

There is no suggestion in Suzuki et al which could lead our person of ordinary skill to the feature and limitation of:

"said cross-sectional area ( $A_1$ ), said dynamic swell stiffness, said length (L) and said cross-sectional area ( $A_2$ ) all being so selected that said hydro bushing has a natural or resonant frequency of approximately 130 Hz." (emphasis added)

Nowhere in Suzuki et al is the above feature and limitation addressed.

Independent claim 7 is even farther away from Suzuki et al and includes the additional limitation of:

"said cross-sectional area ( $A_1$ ) of said work chamber including a constriction." (emphasis added)

Nowhere is there any reference in Suzuki et al of a work chamber including a constriction as set forth in applicants' claim 7.

In view of the above, applicants submit that claims 1 and 7 both patentably distinguish their invention over this reference.

Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al in view of Nakamura et al. The following will show that claims 1 and 7 also patentably

distinguish the applicants' invention over this combination of references.

The deficiencies of Suzuki et al were shown above and Nakamura et al cannot make up for this deficiency.

Nakamura et al discloses a hydraulic bushing bearing having a pair of work chambers 58 which are configured identical to each other. Both work chambers 58 are connected to each other via a passage 60. During vibrations, liquid is displaced from one of the two work chambers 58 into the other work chamber 58.

In contrast to Nakamura et al, the applicants' invention includes a work chamber which is connected to a laterally disposed compensating chamber via the defined dimensioned transfer channel 14a or 14b. There is no suggestion in Nakamura et al with respect to the applicants' configuration and the corresponding selection of area parameters as set forth in detail in both claims 1 and 7. The work chambers of Nakamura et al have a large volume. The element 46 shown in FIG. 2 of Nakamura et al is only a stop for the deflecting movements.

It is not seen how Suzuki et al and Nakamura et al can be combined to arrive at the applicants' invention. Suzuki et al has a rotatable rotor arrangement for setting different passages and the teaching of Nakamura et al is only a connecting channel between two work chambers.

In no way can these two references be combined to arrive at the applicants' invention which is directed to a very specific configuration of a working chamber and a transfer channel which permits a hydraulic bushing to operate in at a frequency of

approximately 130 Hz which applicants submit is a very important and distinctive feature of their invention set forth in both claims 1 and 7.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that claims 1 and 7 should now likewise be allowable and reconsideration of their application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Walter Ottesen  
Reg. No. 25,544

Walter Ottesen  
Patent Attorney  
P.O. Box 4026  
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20885-4026

Phone: (301) 869-8950

Date: February 21, 2006